

ON A DUALITY BETWEEN METRICS AND Σ -PROXIMITIES¹

P. Yu. Chebotarev and E. V. Shamis

UDC 515.124.2:519.11:517.982.224

In studies of discrete structures, functions are frequently used that express the proximity of objects but do not belong to the family of metrics. We consider a class of such functions that is characterized by a normalization condition and an inequality that plays the same role as the triangle inequality does for metrics. We show that the introduced functions, named Σ -proximities (“sigma-proximities”), are in a definite sense dual to metrics: there exists a natural one-to-one correspondence between metrics and Σ -proximities defined on the same finite set; in contrast to metrics, Σ -proximities measure comparative proximity; the closer the objects, the greater the Σ -proximity; diagonal entries of the Σ -proximity matrix characterize the centrality of objects. The results are extended to the case of arbitrary infinite sets of objects.

A metric on a set A is a function $d : A^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that for any $x, y, z \in A$,

- (1) $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$;
- (2) $d(x, y) + d(x, z) - d(y, z) \geq 0$ (triangle inequality).

It follows from this definition that for any $x, y \in A$,

- $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ (symmetry);
- $d(x, y) \geq 0$ (nonnegativity).

Functions that express proximity are not necessarily metrics. Let us consider another class of functions, whose representatives are frequently encountered and implicitly used in both applied and theoretical studies, for instance, in analyses of linear statistical models, Markov processes, electrical circuits and economic models, and also in graph theory and network theory [1-9].

Definition 1. Suppose that A is a nonempty finite set and Σ is a real number. A function $\sigma : A^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ will be referred to as a Σ -proximity (read as “sigma-proximity”) on A , if for any $x, y, z \in A$, the following statements are true:

- (1) normalization condition: $\sum_{t \in A} \sigma(x, t) = \Sigma$;
- (2) triangle inequality: $\sigma(x, y) + \sigma(x, z) - \sigma(y, z) \leq \sigma(x, x)$, and if $z = y$ and $x \neq y$, then the inequality is strict.

The reason why this inequality is referred to as a property of metrics that has a different form will be clear from what follows. By virtue of the normalization condition, every matrix that represents a Σ -proximity has an eigenvector of all ones, Σ being the corresponding eigenvalue. When considering Σ -proximities, we will assume that the set A and the number Σ are fixed, unless otherwise specified.

Proposition 1. Let σ be a Σ -proximity on A . Then for any $x, y \in A$,
 $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(y, x)$ (symmetry);
 if $x \neq y$, then $\sigma(x, x) > \sigma(x, y)$ (egocentrism).

The proofs are given in the Appendix.

The aim of this note is to discover a relationship between Σ -proximities and metrics.

¹This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research, Grant No. 96-01-01010.

Suppose that d is a metric on a finite set A and $|A| = n$. Introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{aligned} d(x, \cdot) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in A} d(x, t), \\ d(\cdot, \cdot) &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{s, t \in A} d(s, t). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2. *For any metric d on a finite set A with $|A| = n$, the function*

$$\sigma(x, y) = d(x, \cdot) + d(y, \cdot) - d(x, y) - d(\cdot, \cdot) + \frac{\Sigma}{n} \quad (1)$$

is a Σ -proximity on A .

The function σ constructed from d with the transformation (1) essentially expresses the proximity between x and y as compared with the average proximity of x and y to all elements of A .

Proposition 3. *For any Σ -proximity σ on A , the function*

$$d(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma(x, x) + \sigma(y, y)) - \sigma(x, y) \quad (2)$$

is a metric on A .

Note that for the determination of $d(x, y)$ with (2), it is sufficient to know the values of σ on three arguments: (x, x) , (y, y) , and (x, y) . In this sense, the transformation (2) is local and resembles taking finite differences. Conversely, (1) is a discrete integral transformation. A noteworthy feature of Σ -proximities derived from metrics is that they provide relative averaged indices of proximity. In particular, by (1), $\sigma(x, x) = 2d(x, \cdot) - d(\cdot, \cdot) + \frac{\Sigma}{n}$, i.e., $\sigma(x, x)$ is greater for those x that have greater average distance from all elements of A . Thus, $\sigma(x, x)$ measures the “provinciality” of x in A : “central” elements have smaller values of $\sigma(x, x)$ than “peripheral” ones. The same is suggested from the normalization condition: $\sigma(x, x) = \Sigma - \sum_{y \neq x} \sigma(x, y)$, and the smaller the $\sigma(x, y)$ (which express the proximity of x to the other elements of A), the greater the $\sigma(x, x)$.

Let $\varphi(d)$ and $\psi(\sigma)$ denote the mappings defined by (1) and (2), respectively.

LEMMA 1. *$\psi(\varphi(d))$ is the identity transformation of the set of metrics defined on A . $\varphi(\psi(\sigma))$ is the identity transformation of the set of Σ -proximities defined on A .*

According to Lemma 1 and Propositions 2 and 3, the mappings $\varphi(d)$ and $\psi(\sigma)$ defined on the set of metrics on A and the set of Σ -proximities on A , respectively, are mutually inverse. This implies the following theorem.

THEOREM 1. *The mappings $\varphi(d)$ and $\psi(\sigma) = \varphi^{-1}(\sigma)$ determine a one-to-one correspondence of the set of metrics on A and the set of Σ -proximities on A .*

0-proximities occupy a central place among Σ -proximities; other Σ -proximities can be obtained from them by a translation of Σ/n (see the normalization condition or (1)). The set of 0-proximities on A as well as the set of metrics on A is closed with respect to addition and multiplication by positive numbers. Note in this connection that for $\Sigma = 0$, φ and ψ are linear mappings of the corresponding sets. The sets of Σ -proximities with other values of Σ are closed with respect to convex combinations. One more important class of Σ -proximities is that of 1-proximities with nonnegative values. These functions can be represented by symmetric doubly stochastic matrices and frequently occur in various applied investigations. It is also worth mentioning Σ -proximities derived from metrics with $\Sigma = nd(\cdot, \cdot)$. Here, the mean proximity equals the mean distance, and the right-hand side of (1) reduces to the first three terms; moreover, $\forall x \in A$, $\sigma(x, x) = 2d(x, \cdot)$.

The concept of Σ -proximity can be extended to infinite sets. A way to do so suggested by the normalization condition is to replace summation with integration in this condition. However, if the measure of A is infinite, this replacement gives rise to a set of functions that has a structure differing from that in the finite case. In particular, Σ -proximities with $\Sigma \neq 0$ cannot be obtained from 0-proximities by the addition of a constant function. A generalization that preserves the properties observed in the finite case can be constructed by the replacement of summation with the operation of averaging. Here there is no need to restrict oneself to an explicit form of the average. Instead, we shall consider abstract averaging functionals and require of them only those properties that are necessary for the proofs of our statements.

Suppose that A is a nonempty set, and $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{A}_2$ are some sets of functions $A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $A^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, respectively.

Definition 2. *A real-valued functional μ defined on a subset $\mathcal{B}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_1$ will be referred to as a linear averaging functional if μ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ have the following properties.*

- (1) $\mathcal{B}_1$ is a linear space over $\mathbb{R}$ containing all constant functions;
- (2) μ is a linear functional over $\mathcal{B}_1$ taking each constant function to its value;
- (3) if $f, g \in \mathcal{B}_1$ and $\forall x \in A$ $f(x) \geq g(x)$, then $\mu(f) \geq \mu(g)$ (monotonicity).

Note that by the Riesz theorem (see, e.g., [10]), under some conditions, among which the most important one is continuity, every linear functional is representable as the Stieltjes integral of its argument with respect to some charge.

Let μ be a linear averaging functional defined on $\mathcal{B}_1$. Suppose that $f \in \mathcal{A}_2$, and for any $x_0 \in A$, $f(x_0, y)$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}_1$ as a function of y . Denote by $f(x, \cdot) = \mu_y(f(x, y))$ the function of x that takes each x to the result of the application of μ to $f(x, y)$ as to a function of y .

Definition 3. We say that a set $\mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2$ is a family of averagable functions of two variables on A if

- $\mathcal{B}_2$ is a linear space over $\mathbb{R}$ that contains all constant functions and all elements of $\mathcal{B}_1$ as functions of each of its arguments constant in the other argument, and
- for any $f \in \mathcal{B}_2$,

- (1) $\forall x \in A$ $g_x(y) \in \mathcal{B}_1$, where $g_x(y) = f(x, y)$;
- (2) $f(x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{B}_1$ and $g(x) \in \mathcal{B}_1$, where $g(x) = f(x, x)$.

Now the notion of Σ -proximity can be generalized as follows. Let A be a nonempty set and suppose that $\mathcal{B}_1, \mu$, and $\mathcal{B}_2$ are as defined above; m is a real number.

Definition 1'. A function $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_2$ will be called a Σ_m -proximity on A if for any $x, y, z \in A$, the following statements hold:

- (1) normalization condition: $\sigma(x, \cdot) = m$, and
- (2) triangle inequality (the same as in Definition 1): $\sigma(x, y) + \sigma(x, z) - \sigma(y, z) \leq \sigma(x, x)$, and if $z = y$ and $x \neq y$, then the inequality is strict.

The following primed statements are similar to those formulated above. The plans of the proofs remain the same, but wherever the properties of the arithmetic mean and the normalization condition in the summation form were used, now the properties of a linear averaging functional μ and sets $\mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2$ are applied. In particular, precisely due to the requirements imposed on $\mathcal{B}_2$, this set contains the images of the mappings φ and ψ .

Proposition 1'. For any Σ_m -proximity $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}_2$ and for any $x, y \in A$,

- $\sigma(x, y) = \sigma(y, x)$ (symmetry);
- $\sigma(x, x) \geq \sigma(x, y)$ (egocentrism).

The reason that the above inequality weakens here is that in the case of infinite A it is natural to require the monotonicity rather than the strict monotonicity of μ (cf. Definition 2 and the proof of Proposition 1). Note that the monotonicity of μ is not used in the proofs of the subsequent statements (with the exception of Corollary 1). Due to the symmetry of Σ_m -proximities and metrics, we need not require the commutativity of μ_x and μ_y applied to functions from $\mathcal{B}_2$. This way, the symmetry ensures that the notation $d(\cdot, \cdot) = \mu_{\mu_y}(d(x, y)) = \mu_{\mu_x}(d(x, y))$ in the following statement is well defined of (not to be confused with $\mu(d(x, x))$).

Proposition 2'. For any metric $d \in \mathcal{B}_2$, the function

$$\sigma(x, y) = d(x, \cdot) + d(y, \cdot) - d(x, y) - d(\cdot, \cdot) + m \quad (3)$$

is a Σ_m -proximity on A .

Proposition 3'. For any Σ_m -proximity σ , the function

$$d(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\sigma(x, x) + \sigma(y, y)) - \sigma(x, y) \quad (4)$$

is a metric on A and belongs to $\mathcal{B}_2$.

Let $\varphi(d)$ and $\psi(\sigma)$ be the mappings defined by (3) and (4), respectively.

LEMMA 1'. The mappings $\psi(\varphi(d))$ and $\varphi(\psi(\sigma))$ are the identity transformations of the set of metrics that belong to $\mathcal{B}_2$ and the set of Σ_m -proximities on A , respectively.

THEOREM 1'. The mappings $\varphi(d)$ and $\psi(\sigma) = \varphi^{-1}(\sigma)$ determine a one-to-one correspondence of the set of metrics that belong to $\mathcal{B}_2$ and the set of Σ_m -proximities on A .

Note, in conclusion, that turning to Σ_m -proximities can be of help in proving some statements about average distances. For example, the fact stated below immediately follows from Theorem 1' and Proposition 1'.

COROLLARY 1. For any set A , metric $d \in \mathcal{B}_2$, and $x \in A$,

$$d(x, \cdot) \geq \frac{d(\cdot, \cdot)}{2}. \quad (5)$$

Observe, for completeness, that this inequality cannot be refined by replacing $1/2$ with a greater factor. Indeed, it suffices to consider an infinite A (or a sequence of finite A with an increasing number of elements) and the “almost discrete” metric with one “central” element x_0 such that $\forall x_1, x_2 \in A \setminus \{x_0\}, d(x_1, x_2) = 1, d(x_1, x_0) = 1/2$. If A is finite, it follows from Theorem 1 and Proposition 1 that the inequality (5) takes a strict form. By considering the set A that consists of a line segment and a remote point, it is easy to show that the ratio $d(x, \cdot)/d(\cdot, \cdot)$ (here $d(\cdot, \cdot) > 0$ is assumed) is not bounded above.

APPENDIX

Proof of Proposition 1. Symmetry is shown by putting $z = x$ in the triangle inequality and using the arbitrariness of x and y . To prove egocentrism, consider again the triangle inequality, now assuming $x \neq y$: for any $z \in A$, we have

$$\sigma(x, y) + \sigma(x, z) - \sigma(y, z) \leq \sigma(x, x).$$

Summing these inequalities over all $z \in A$ and taking into account that at $z = y$ the inequality is strict, we have

$$n\sigma(x, y) + \sum_{z \in A} \sigma(x, z) - \sum_{z \in A} \sigma(y, z) < n\sigma(x, x),$$

where $n = |A|$, and by the normalization condition, $\sigma(x, x) > \sigma(x, y)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 2. The normalization condition is verified straightforwardly. To prove the triangle inequality, note that the substitution (1) yields

$$\sigma(x, x) + \sigma(y, z) - \sigma(x, y) - \sigma(x, z) = d(x, y) + d(x, z) - d(y, z), \quad (6)$$

and the nonstrict part of the triangle inequality for σ follows from the inequality of the same name for d . At $z = y$ and $x \neq y$, the right-hand side of (6) becomes $2d(x, y) - d(y, y)$, and the strict statement of the triangle inequality for σ follows from the first axiom of metrics and the nonnegativity of $d(x, y)$. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3. By virtue of (2), $d(x, x) = 0$ for any $x \in A$, and according to the strict part of the triangle inequality for σ , $d(x, y) > 0$ when $x \neq y$. To prove the triangle inequality for d , it suffices to make substitution (2) resulting in the familiar equality (6),

$$d(x, y) + d(x, z) - d(y, z) = \sigma(x, x) + \sigma(y, z) - \sigma(x, y) - \sigma(x, z),$$

and to use the nonstrict part of the triangle inequality for σ . $\square$

Proof of Lemma 1. The first statement is verified by substituting (1) in (2) and making use of the first axiom of metrics; the second one is verified by substituting (2) in (1) and using the normalization condition. $\square$

Proof of Corollary 1. Consider the Σ_0 -proximity σ to which the operator φ takes d . By (3), for any $x \in A$, we have

$$\sigma(x, x) = 2d(x, \cdot) - d(\cdot, \cdot). \quad (7)$$

If $\sigma(x, x) < 0$, then egocentrism implies $\sigma(x, y) \leq \sigma(x, x) < 0 \forall y \in A$, and the normalization condition is broken by virtue of Definition 2. Hence, $\sigma(x, x) \geq 0$, and combining it with (7) yields the required inequality. $\square$

REFERENCES

1. V. E. Golender, V. V. Drboglav, and A. B. Rosenblit, “Graph potentials method and its application for chemical information processing,” *J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.*, **21**, 196–204 (1981).
2. K. Stephenson and M. Zelen, “Rethinking centrality: Methods and examples,” *Social Networks*, **11**, 1–37 (1989).
3. M. Altman, “Reinterpreting network measures for models of disease transmission,” *Social Networks*, **15**, 1–17 (1993).

4. D. J. Klein and M. Randić, "Resistance distance," *J. Math. Chem.*, **12**, 81–95 (1993).
5. M. Kunz, "On topological and geometrical distance matrices," *J. Math. Chem.*, **13**, 145–151 (1993).
6. P. Yu. Chebotarev and E. Shamis, "On the proximity measure for graph vertices provided by the inverse Laplacian characteristic matrix," in: *5th Conference of the International Linear Algebra Society*, Georgia State University, Atlanta (1995), pp. 30–31.
7. R. Merris, "Doubly stochastic graph matrices," *Univ. Beograd. Publ. Elektrotehn. Fak., Ser. Mat.*, **8**, 64–71 (1997).
8. P. Yu. Chebotarev and E. V. Shamis, "The matrix-forest theorem and measuring relations in small social groups," *Automat. Remote Control*, **58**, No. 9, Part 2, 1505–1514 (1997).
9. N. E. Friedkin, "Theoretical foundations for centrality measures," *Amer. J. Sociology*, **96**, 1478–1504 (1991).
10. A. Kolmogorov and S. Fomine, *Éléments de la Théorie des Fonctions et de l'Analyse Fonctionnelle*, Mir, Moscow (1977).